



[WWW.AZCLIMATECHANGE.US](http://WWW.AZCLIMATECHANGE.US)

**SUMMARY OF TELECONFERENCE MEETING #1  
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP  
ARIZONA CLIMATE CHANGE ADVISORY GROUP  
AUGUST 31, 2005**

**Attendance:**

1. Technical Working Group members:
  - Diane Brown – Arizona Public Interest Research Group
  - Beverly Chenausky – Arizona Department of Transportation
  - Becky Daggett – Governor’s Growing Smarter Council
  - Rob Elliott – Arizona Raft Adventures
  - Kirsten Engel – University of Arizona Law School
  - Gina Grey – Western States Petroleum Association
  - Ursula Kramer – Pima County DEQ
  - Karen O’Regan – City of Phoenix
  - John Skelley - Arizona Grain
  - Duane Yantorno – Arizona Department of Weights and Measures
2. ADEQ staff: Kurt Maurer
3. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff: Karl Hausker, Tom Peterson

**Background documents:**

*(all posted at <http://www.azclimatechange.us/template.cfm?FrontID=4672>)*

1. Agenda
2. Powerpoint presentation for meeting
3. AZ draft Inventory and Reference case
4. TLU GHG Reduction Opportunities (policy matrix)

**Discussion items and key issues:**

1. Inventory and reference case projections
  - a. CCS noted an implicit projection in the MoveAZ report: that energy use per VMT would increase over the next 20 years. ADOT’s Beverly Chenausky agreed to

contact the consultants who authored the MoveAZ report and obtain the explicit assumptions used in the report that affect energy use per VMT.

- b. Gina Grey (Western States Petroleum Association) asked CCS staff to look at potential effect of the Bush Administrations new proposal on CAFÉ standards.
  - c. Rob Elliott (Arizona Raft Adventures) endorsed the use of an assumption of constant energy use per VMT, as in the draft projection.
  - d. A member suggested that CCS consult also with Dave Berry (Swift Transportation) to see if he has thoughts or data to share on freight projections.
2. Decision criteria for selecting options for further analysis
- a. Rob Elliot suggesting that the TWG consider whether and how an option can fit into a regional approach to GHG mitigation. There was no objection and CCS noted that this characteristic could come under the category of “feasibility.”
3. Matrix of policy options
- a. Diane Brown (Arizona PIRG) suggested the strong need to look at the public health co-benefits of policy options, and the comprehensive, lifecycle impacts of biodiesel and ethanol.
  - b. Karen O’Regan and Ursula Kramer noted that many cities and counties are engaged in Smart Growth activities.
  - c. Members asked for more information on the options in the matrix.

### **Next steps and agreements:**

1. In preparation for the second call, CCS staff will fill in selected columns of the strategy matrix (emission reduction potential and cost) to the extent possible based on a combination of experience in other states and emissions projections for Arizona. TWG members are requested to provide further inputs on the matrix and specific options, especially any missing ones, as soon as possible. .
2. **Next TWG call**  
**Wednesday, Sept. 14, 2005, from 8 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.**